



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/429,094	10/28/99	YATES	30585/16

DAVID E BOUNDY ESQ
SHEARMAN & STERLING
599 LEXINGTON AVENUE
NEW YORK NY 10022

LM01/0928

EXAMINER

ENG, D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2783

3

DATE MAILED: 09/28/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/429,094

Applicant(s)
Yates et al.

Examiner
David Y. Eng

Group Art Unit
2783



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David Y. Eng

(3) _____

(2) David Boundy

(4) _____

Date of Interview Sep 25, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 10, 14, and 19

Identification of prior art discussed:

Adachi,

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants directed the examiner's attention to pages 100-116 of the specification. Applicants further explain that certain instructions are more efficiently executed in RISC code than in X86 code. The instant invention is to provide a table having entries therein for transferring, when those instructions are encountered, the control from X86 code to RISC code for execution. Applicants further contend that the table alters the execution from normal (add, for example) to branch. The examiner disagrees such interpretation. The examiner's position is that the execution is not changed because the transferred instruction is still an add instruction to be executed in RISC code and that only the control is transferred.

Applicants further contend that rejection of the claims under incomplete is in error because such rejection has been abolished by USPTO. The examiner disagrees and refers the applicants to section 706.03(d) and 2172.01 of the MPEP.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.